REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on May 7, 2004.

No claims are amended, cancelled, or added herein. Claims 1-12 and 25-32 are pending.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 6-12, 25-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito et al. (US 6,484,093). To sustain an anticipation rejection each and every step or element of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited reference. Here, Ito fails to teach or even suggest data compression as is positively recited in Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, and 25.

Initially, Applicants incorporate by reference herein their previous arguments with respect to the Ito reference. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reading and inferences drawn from the Ito reference with respect to data compression and decompression.

Ito is directed to a technique for communicating route guidance to a vehicle guidance device. Ito has taken an exact opposite approach from what is described and positively recited in Applicants' independent claims. That is, Ito elected (intentionally) not to teach data compression; rather, Ito relies on a novel data header (segmental data 1 header of FIG. 4(A) in Ito) that defines how many route segments are in a transmitted data file from an information center. Ito, col. 10, lines 5-39. A clear reading of the plain text of Ito for FIGS. 4(A) and 4(B) elucidates this point, where FIG. 4(B) is just an exploded view of what is contained in FIG. 4(A) and is clearly not an implication of data compression or decompression.

A vehicle guidance device can have only so much memory and processing capabilities and clearly route guidance information is voluminous. As a result, Ito's approach was to utilize novel communication processing and novel headers for data information to continually stream needed route segments to a vehicle guidance device as it travels and traverses an already received route segment. If the vehicle guidance device did not have enough memory to receive all needed route segments, then it contacted the information center for the remaining portions just before they were needed. If a problem in communication occurred, then the vehicle guidance device used what it had stored in memory and when the communication resolved the

information center was contacted and the needed route segments acquired dynamically from the information center.

Ito solved the problem of voluminous route guidance data through novel data headers combined with communication to an information center. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have inferred from Ito that Ito was using or teaching compression and decompression, because Ito elected to solve the problem of voluminous data through data headers and regular or continuous communication with an information center. Therefore, it cannot be implied that Ito implicitly teaches, uses, or suggests data compression and decompression. In fact, if Ito had used such a technique than its information center would not have been needed. And, yet the information center and communication it achieves with the vehicle guidance device are critical and core pieces of the teachings presented in Ito.

Accordingly, Applicants continue to respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assessment of the Ito reference vis-à-vis the Applicants' independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Ito rejections.

Moreover, Applicants' independent claims teach, among other things, a novel type of compression on coordinate data, where each coordinate data has three or more dimensions. Applicants do not agree that the reference text cited by the Examiner at column 8 and lines 30-47 teach this limitation. Applicants infer from this reference location that typical GPS coordinates can be supplemented with another system entirely should a signal from the GPS be temporarily lost. This does not associated three or more dimensions with the GPS coordinates; it supplements the GPS coordinates or replaces them when the coordinates are no longer available because the GPS signal was temporarily lost.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation presented by the Examiner and respectfully assert again that the Ito references teaches an entirely different approach than what is positively recited in Applicants' independent claims. That is, Ito does not implicitly teach any form of data compression or decompression, and Ito does not implicitly teach coordinate data have three or more dimensions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the Ito rejection.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Robinson et al. (US 5,995,970). Claims 3-5 are dependent claims from Applicants' independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants assert that the obviousness rejections with respect to the combination of Ito and Robinson cannot be sustained in view of the remarks presented above with respect to Applicants' independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 3-5 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Please send correspondence to:

Devon A. Rolf
GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
1200 East 151ST Street
Olathe, KS 66062

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL CHILDS ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 7-20-04

By _____
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 20 day of July, 2004.

CANDIS BUENDING
Name

_____
Signature